CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.

RESEARCH REPORT

The Development and Delivery of a Scale for the Evaluation of Risk-Needs (SERN) in Romanian Probation Services

2018 Nº R-402

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

Correctional Service Canada | Service correctionnel Canada

Canada

The Development and Delivery of a Scale for the Evaluation of Risk-Needs (SERN) in Romanian Probation Services

Larry Motiuk

Correctional Service of Canada

September 2017

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere thanks to a great number of people who assisted in this study. Iuliana Carbunaru, Octavian Pana, and Marian Badea, of the Romanian Probation Service and Mihai Popescu, the Romanian Group for Human Rights Defence (GRADO) were critical in providing the necessary support and co-ordination of the project and deserve considerable thanks.

Valentin Schiaucu, Gabriel Oancea, Diana Obagel, Nicoleta Jlassi, Christina Calin, Ligia Dumitascu, Ramona Balaita and Evelina Obersterscu were instrumental in developing the Prototype I - (SERN) to facilitate data collection. In addition, we are very grateful for the co-operation of the many probation staff from the various RPS settings, including Arges, Constanta, Cluj, Suceava and Vrancea.

Finally, a special thanks to Leslie-Ann Keown and Ben Vuong at the Correctional Service of Canada for assistance with data analysis.

Executive Summary

Key words: *risk/needs assessment, re-offending, Romanian probation services, Romanian offenders*

The application of offender risk/needs assessment technology to improve correctional performance on reducing re-offending is a major project underway in the Probation Services of Romania (RPS). This project falls under the auspices of a technical exchange between RPS and the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). The present report examines the results of an enhanced case management approach to offender risk/needs assessment that was undertaken by probation staff in Romania.

The 'Static Factors' and 'Dynamic Factors' components of CSC's risk assessment and management processes were adapted and field tested in a variety of RPS settings. The present investigation began with the design and development of an instrument for offender risk/needs evaluation in Romania. The Scale for the Evaluation of Risk/Needs (SERN) protocol for probationers was comprised of three sections: 1) Static Risk Factors (12 criminal history items and risk level rating); 2) Dynamic Risk Factors or criminogenic needs (9 domains with 2 items each totalling 18 items and needs level rating); and 3) Special Needs and Summary (priority needs, overall risk-needs and motivation). A snapshot sample of 751 probationers (673 men; 78 women) who were assessed while under the supervision of RPS over the course of a one-month period (September 2014) was assembled for study. The largest number of cases were obtained from the county office of Constanta (n=230), followed by Arges (n=185), Cluj (n=165), Suceava (n=93) and Vrancea (n=78). Probationers who had been under supervision between 0 to 6 months represented the largest proportion of cases (42.9%), whereas those between 6 to 12 months and 12 months or more were equally represented in the remaining cases (28.5% and 28.6%, respectively).

It is very important to highlight that the purpose of this phase of the project was to familiarise RPS staff with risk/needs-based assessment technology and scientifically testing adapted instrumentation. Although explorations of the various distributions as well as relationships between ratings of risk and needs are made, a note of caution is warranted when attempting to extrapolate findings to particular segments of the RPS population. A more rigorously designed survey exercise would have to be undertaken to yield proper estimates of resources in responding to offender risk and needs.

The results of the 'risk/needs' field study replicated international findings regarding the operational value of systematically assessing and re-assessing offender risk and need. Both men and women probationers were easily differentiated by RPS staff as to the level of risk and needs as well as the nature of needs presented by probationers. Overall, the risk level distributions of low-, moderate- and high-risk level cases were 67%, 28% and 5%, respectively. On the other hand, the needs level distributions of low-, moderate- and high-need cases were 49**%, 41% and 10%, respectively. Interestingly, combining risk and need level ratings resulted in the majority of probation cases being assessed in the low risk/low needs and low risk/moderate needs categories, 44% and 21%, respectively. The next major risk-needs category was those assessed as moderate-risk/moderate needs (18%) with a small percentage in the high-risk/high-needs category (4%). Not surprisingly, women probationers were more likely than men to be assessed as low risk/low needs (52% versus

43%) and low risk/moderate needs (27% and 21%) whereas men probationers were more likely to be assessed as high risk/high needs (4% versus 1%).

An examination of Static Factors [12 criminal history risk indicators: under age, previous adult conviction(s), violent criminal offence(s), earlier probation term, pre-release technical, pre-release failure, new crime, earlier prison term, escape/attempt/unlawfully at large, confinement for disciplinary reasons, less than six months since last incarceration, no crime free period of one-year or more, co-convicted] revealed some previous involvement (i.e., 20% previous adult conviction) with the Romanian criminal justice system for those evaluated in the field study. Interestingly, a substantial percentage of probation cases were identified as being co-convicted (46%). Moreover, this finding was roughly equivalent for men and women probationers. However, men probationers were found to be twice as likely to have had a previous adult conviction (20% and 10%, respectively).

Combining the twelve criminal history indicators resulted in a Static Risk Factors index (scores ranging from 0 to 11, out of a possible 12) that corresponded significantly with overall risk level ratings (eta^2=0.51 $p < .0001$). As well, the Static Risk Factors index were significantly related with risk level ratings for men (eta^2=0.51 $p < .0001$) and women (eta^2=0.52 $p < .0001$).

All nine need areas (education V=.34, employment V=.42, family background V=.45, social contacts V=.45, substance abuse V=.23, community living V=.44, thinking/behaviour V=.38, criminal attitude V=.34, and values orientation V=.54) were found to relate significantly to staff ratings of need level. Men probationers were more likely than women to have identified needs in the areas of education, substance abuse, thinking/behavior, and values orientation. The three most prominent Dynamic Risk Factors indicators identified for men were education less than grade 12 (58%), difficulty with linking actions to consequences (39%) and criminal friends (37%). For women, the three most prominent Dynamic Risk Factors indicators identified were having less than grade 12 (41%), denying, minimizing or rationalizing criminal behavior (39%) and being unemployed (36%).

Combining the 18 need indicators resulted in a Dynamic Risk Factors index (scores ranging from 0 to 17, out of a possible 18) that corresponded significantly with overall need level ratings eta^2=0.60 $p < .0001$). As well, the Dynamic Factors index correlated significantly with ratings for men (eta^2=0.61 $p < .0001$) and women (eta^2=0.51 $p < .0001$). Moreover, the Static Risk Factors index correlated significantly with the Dynamic Risk Factors index (r=.52 $p < .0001$).

Another important observation was that the Static and Dynamic Risk indices were related significantly with their respective ratings levels across the three separate phases of supervision. The Static Risk index correlated significantly with risk level rating for those under supervision for less than 6 months (eta^2=0.54 $p < .0001$); 6 to 12 months (eta^2=0.67 $p < .0001$); as well as 12 months and over (eta^2=0.61 $p < .0001$). Similarly, the Dynamic Risk index correlated significantly with need level rating for those less than 6 months (eta^2=0.45 $p < .0001$); 6 to 12 months eta^2=0.47 $p < .0001$); as well as 12 months and over (eta^2=0.64 $p < .0001$).

Finally, aggregating the criminal history risk and criminogenic needs indices into a total SERN index for Romanian probationers (scores ranging from 0 to 26, out of a possible 30) was found to be correlated significantly with both overall risk level ratings (eta^2=0.44 $p < .0001$) and needs level ratings (eta^2=0.55 $p < .0001$). The total SERN index for men probationers correlated significantly with both overall risk level ratings (eta^2=0.44 $p < .0001$) and needs level ratings (eta^2=0.53 $p < .0001$). Similarly, the total SERN index for women probationers correlated significantly with both

overall risk level ratings (eta^2=0.45 p <.0001) and needs level ratings (eta^2=0.47 p <.0001). The aforementioned means that information derived from the assessment protocol can be reliably quantified in ways which accurately reflect adjustment to community-based supervision. Furthermore, the utilization of a structured format significantly improves the ability to identify targets for intervention for probation, thereby reducing likelihood of re-involvement with the criminal justice system.

Initially, a six month post assessment follow-up revealed a very small number of cases (10) who had reoffended and the vast majority still under supervision. Nevertheless, a closer look at those who had failed while on probation at a one-year follow-up were deemed to be higher risk, higher need and scored substantially higher on the total SERN risk index. Notwithstanding the crucial relationship between predictive accuracy and recidivism base rates, the foregoing analyses on probation outcome would have been better served with a higher failure rate. While fortunate from a community safety perspective, the sustained high success rate on supervision over a one-year follow-up period yielded a 2% (or 15 cases) failure rate which is a problematic base rate for statistical calibration. Of special note, only one woman probationer had failed while on supervision.

Again, an examination of those who had failed revealed them to be higher risk and higher need. While 6% of men probationers were assessed to be high risk, 58% of those who had failed were assessed to be high risk. More importantly and consistent with the international literature, criminal history indicators reflective of being co-convicted, no crime-free period of one year or more, early age onset of criminal activity, and previous probation terms could be deemed as characteristics of probation failure for men probationers. Moreover, the low incidence (under 5%) and failure rate among them in the study sample suggest the deletion of four criminal history risk indicators (pre-release failure-technical, escape/attempt/unlawfully at large, confinement for disciplinary reasons and less than six months since last incarceration). With respect to criminogenic needs, the incidence of indicators, inter-dependent relationships and association with outcome suggest retention of the indicators across all of the domains.

Upon having successfully introduced risk/needs-based assessment technology in RPS, a next step would be to expand the nature and scope of the SERN initiative into a broader implementation exercise. Using the full application (Administrative Information, Evaluation of Risk/Needs, and Sentence Plan) would have added benefits whereby standardised reports are generated, sentence plans are produced and valuable management information is delivered for strategic planning purposes. Implementation would necessarily shift the focus from raising awareness about variation in offender and needs in RPS to an enhanced case management function that yields estimates for resource allocation.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

Executive Summary iii

List of Tables vii

Introduction 1

Method 4

Phase 1: Design and development 4

Instrumentation 4

Phase 2: Field Administration 5

Study Sample 5

Results 7

Part A. Static Factors Assessment 7

Static Factors Risk Indicators: Criminal Record 7

1. Criminal History Risk Indicators 7

2. Static Factors Rating (Risk) - Setting 8

3. Static Factor Rating (Risk) - Gender 9

4. Static Factor Rating (Risk) – Supervision Phase 9

Part B. Dynamic Factors Assessment 10

1. Identified Needs 10

2. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Setting 15

3. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Gender 15

4. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Supervision Phase 16

Part C. Risk/Need Level Assessment 16

1. Risk/Needs Rating and Setting... 16

2. Risk/Needs Rating and Gender 17

Part D. Indices: Static Risk, Dynamic Risk, Totals and Outcome 18

1. Static Risk Index- Calculated 18

2. Dynamic Risk Index - Calculated 20

3. Overall SERN index – calculated 23

Part E. Inter-relationships between Need Domains and SERN Index 25

Discussion 27

Conclusions 28
References 29
Appendix A: Probationer Risk/Needs Assessment 30

List of Tables

Table 1 *Distribution of Probation Cases by Gender* 6
Table 2 *Distribution of probation cases by supervision phase* 6
Table 3 *Distribution of Criminal History Indicators by Gender* 8
Table 4 *Distribution of Risk Level Ratings across Settings* 9
Table 5 *Distribution of Risk Level Ratings by Gender* 9
Table 6 *Distribution of Risk Level Ratings by Supervision Phase* 10
Table 7 *Distribution of Identified Need Domains by Gender* 10
Table 8 *Distribution of Identified Need Indicators by Gender* 11
Table 9 *Inter-correlation (bivariate) Matrix of Needs* 12
Table 10 *Overall Dynamic Need Level by Dynamic Need Domains* 14
Table 11 *Distribution of Need Level Ratings across Settings* 15
Table 12 *Distribution of Need Level Ratings by Gender* 16
Table 13 *Distribution of Need Level Ratings by Supervision Phase* 16
Table 14 *Distribution of Risk/Need Levels by Setting* 17
Table 15 *Distribution of Risk/Need Levels by Gender* 18
Table 16 *Distribution of Static Risk Index Scores by Gender and Outcome* 19
Table 17 *Static Risk Level (assigned) compared to Static Risk Index (calculated)* 19
Table 18 *Static Risk Level compared to Static Risk Index across Supervision Phases* 20
Table 19 *Distribution of Dynamic Risk Index Scores by Gender and Outcome* 21
Table 20 *Dynamic Need Level (assigned) compared to Dynamic Risk Index (calculated)* 22
Table 21 *Dynamic Need Level compared to Dynamic Risk Index across Supervision Phases* 22
Table 22 *Distribution of Total SERN Index Scores by Gender and Outcome* 23
Table 23 *Static Risk Level compared to Total SERN Risk Index* 24
Table 24 *Dynamic Need Level compared to Total SERN Risk Index* 25
Table 25 *Means Comparison of SERN Totals by Needs* 26

Introduction

The Romanian Probation Service (RPS) exists within the Romanian Justice Ministry and supervises individuals who reside in the community after being convicted of crimes. The RPS is relatively young and focused on developing and applying new practices and tools. Even though the professionalization of practice has reached remarkable outcomes, probation services in Romania still does not have a risk assessment tool. The creation of an offender risk assessment tool similar to those administered in Canada, but specifically designed for the Romanian offender population, has been identified as an area of technical exchange.

In 1988, as part of field testing of new standards for community supervision, parole officers of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) were required to use a systematic approach to assess the needs of offenders, the risk of re-offending and any other factors that might affect successful reintegration to the community. A Community Risk/Needs Management Scale was thus developed and implemented. This Scale used case-specific information on criminal history and a critical set of offender needs (e.g., employment, substance abuse) to classify offenders on conditional release (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989a). Based on the information, offenders are classified as being either low-, medium- or high-risk and low-, medium- or high-need. Validation work on the Community Risk/Needs management scale found as many as 47.5% of offenders assessed as high-risk and high-need were suspended within six months of their assessment (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989b). On the other hand, substantially fewer offenders assessed as low-risk and low-need (5.1%) was suspended while on conditional release. Of particular interest, this low-risk and low-need group was the largest group among all the risk/need level groupings, representing 35% of the total sample of cases that were assessed (Motiuk & Porporino, 1989). Therefore, reducing the frequency of supervision for these lower risk cases can have important implications for the reallocation and refocusing of resources (Andrews, Bonta, and Hogue, 1990; Motiuk & Bonta, 1991).

In CSC, offender assessment begins even before the offender enters the federal correctional system. Once an offender has been sentenced to serve two years or more, a Community Parole Officer will meet with them to complete a post sentence community assessment. The post sentence community assessment provides valuable assessment information about probationers and their immediate needs. The next step occurs when the offender arrives at

a CSC intake facility and the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process is done (Motiuk, 1997a; Motiuk 1997b). The Institutional Parole Officer assesses the following: An Immediate Needs Assessment (Security, Health); a Static Factors Assessment (Criminal History Record-Youth and Adult [38 indicators] and Offence Severity Record); a Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (7 need domains-Employment/Education, Marital/Family Functioning, Associates/Social Interaction, Community Functioning, Personal/Emotional Orientation, Substance Abuse, Attitudes); Supplementary Assessments (Literacy, Vocational, Psychological, etc.); an Engagement rating (Accountability & Motivation); a Criminal Profile and an individualized Correctional Plan.

While the OIA was fully automated and nationally implemented in 1994, several adjustments have been made to the process. The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (Brown & Motiuk, 2005) component was streamlined (7 need domains remained but the number of indicators were substantially reduced from 197 to 100) and incorporated probationers' levels of accountability and motivation in measuring their correctional plan engagement. The engagement of offenders in their correctional plans is essential for effective and efficient rehabilitation, in order for them to address their needs and lower their risk levels.

In 1992, Romania took the first measure towards a system of probation by implementing within criminal law several probation elements, such as the "suspension under supervision" which is a special form of suspension of the execution of the penalty provided in the criminal code. In 1996, was added the educational measure of "liberty under surveillance" and a new form of suspension under supervision or control for minors. At that time however, the absence of probation services led to an inefficient application of the mentioned legislative changes. Known as the experimental stage, the first probation centre in Romania was set up in Arad County and subsequently 11 experimental centres were added.

In 2000, the institution of probation was legally established by adopting the *Government Ordinance no 92/2000 regarding the organizing and functioning of the social reintegration services for probationers and the supervising of the execution of non-custodial sentences,* which was approved in 2002 through Law no. 129. The legislation was enforced by probation work.

Between 2001 and 2002, at the national level, the institution of probation was developed in two stages: 2001, 28 services and 2002, 13 services. Between 2003 and 2010, the stage of institutional consolidation saw specific legislation being adopted, ex. *Law on the status of the*

probation services personnel; the employment of new staff; and the increased number of supervision cases.

The RPS became organized at the central level with a Directorate for Probation – Ministry of Justice and at the local level with 42 probation services, one in each county of Romania, attached to the courts and under the authority of the Ministry of Justice.

Over the years, there has been a steady increase in the number of cases (convicted persons under probation) during the developmental stages from 1,000 in 2002 to over 16,000 in 2012. With respect to penitentiary statistics, the population has declined from over 50,000 in 2002 to approximately 30,000 in 2012.

Currently, RPS is organized as a probation department within the Ministry of Justice. At the central office are the Director and staff (probation inspectors, legal advisors, psychologists). At each of the 42 probation services there is a Chief of Probation and a number of Probation Counsellors.

New Criminal Code Perspective – 2014

Currently, attributions include preparing assessment reports for the accused minors – prosecution; preparing, the pre-sentence reports for the minor or adult probationers – Court; and preparing the supervision reports for the convicted minor or adult probationers, at the request of the Court, in case that they break the obligations and measures imposed on them.

International advances in the systematic and structured assessment of offender risk and need levels resulted in RPS exploring the potential applicability of this technology to improve performance on important correctional outcomes – managing community supervision risk and reducing re-offending.

Method

The SERN development in RPS involved:

1) design and development of an offender risk/needs assessment instrument;
2) field administration of an assessment protocol;
3) data compilation; and
4) analyses.

Phase 1: Design and development

Staff familiarization on offender risk-needs assessment was based on a streamlined version of the CSC's Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process. Discussions took place over a three-day period at RPS central office in Bucharest. Over a dozen participants from RPS took part in the session. Administration guidelines and data input routines were provided to staff involved in the field test.

Instrumentation

All data were gathered by the prototype Evaluation of Risk and Needs Scale (SERN) and case-specific information was derived from records. Briefly, the SERN protocol collects and organizes comprehensive risk-needs information on each offender. Case-specific information on Static Risk Factors or criminal history (Section 1) and Dynamic Risk Factors or criminogenic needs (Section 2) was derived from the RPS SERN. The SERN considers a wide variety of aspects relevant to the offender's personal background and life situation.

Section 1 Static Risk Factors of SERN provides twelve indicators of criminal history background covering both under age and adult records. An indicator check can be made for under age, any previous adult convictions (including number), violent criminal offences, earlier probation term(s), pre-release failure – technical reasons, pre-release failure - new crime, earlier prison terms, attempt escape/UAL/escapes, confinement for disciplinary reasons, less than six months since last incarceration, no crime-free period of one year or more, and co-convicted. An overall rating for Static Risk Factors ranges from "low-", "moderate-", to "high".

In Section 2, Criminogenic Needs of SERN, data is organized under nine need areas or dynamic risk factors covering: education, employment, family, social contacts, substance abuse,

community functioning, thinking/behaviour, criminal attitude and values orientation. Based on guidelines, an overall Dynamic Factors (need) rating for each offender ranges from "low-", "moderate-", to "high".

Section 3 of SERN notes whether the offender has any special needs such as medical, security, mental health, suicide risk and other.

Phase 2: Field Administration

RPS probation staff completed the SERN protocol for all cases under their supervision at selected settings. Field test instructions were as follows:

- Gather hard copies of Administrative Information Sheet (Part A) and Probation Risk/Needs Assessment instrument (Part B) for all cases included in the field test.
- Complete Administrative Information Sheet for all cases and the Probation Risk/Needs Assessment instrument according to the following criteria:
    - Beginning July 1, 2014 at the selected field test sites. For men probationers on caseload complete all sections of the Probation Risk/Needs Assessment instrument for every 3rd case listed. For women probationers complete assessment instrument on all cases.
    - Beginning August 1, 2014 at the selected field test sites. For all sections of the Probation Risk/Needs Assessment instrument for all new cases (men and women) over 1-month period.
- First package of Romanian hard copies Administrative Information Sheet and the Probation Risk/Needs Assessment, as well as listings or electronic files of one caseload cases for transmittal by September 30, 2014.

The field test data were extracted from the SERN protocols for analysis.

Study Sample

From the start date of the field test, a total of 751 probationers were evaluated and their data were entered into the SERN protocol. Of these, 673 (90%) were men and the remainder (78 or 10%) were women. Adult probationers comprised 100% of the total study sample collected for the pilot and included 185 probationers from the Arges, 165 from the Cluj, 230 from Constanta, 93 from Suceava and 78 from Vrancea probation services (Table 1). There was no significant difference in the distribution of men and women by setting.

Table 1

Distribution of Probation Cases by Gender

Setting	*n*	Men	Women
Arges	185	88%	12%
Cluj	165	91%	9%
Constanta	230	90%	10%
Suceava	93	87%	13%
Vrancea	78	92%	8%
Total	751	90 %	10%

χ^2 2.537 p=.638

As Table 2 reflects, probationers who had been under supervision between 0 to 6 months represented the largest proportion of cases (43%), whereas those between 6 to 12 months and 12 months or more were equally represented in the remainder (29% and 28%, respectively). Regions did not differ in regards to supervision phase.

Table 2

Distribution of probation cases by supervision phase

Setting	*n*	0 to 6 months	6 to 12 months	12 + months
Arges	185	42%	29%	29%
Cluj	165	43%	29%	28%
Constanta	230	42%	29%	29%
Suceava	93	43%	29%	28%
Vrancea	78	44%	28%	28%
Total	751	43%	29%	28%

χ^2 0.044 p=1.00

Results

Part A. Static Factors Assessment

Criminal history indicators were extracted from the *Static Factors Assessment* component of RPS-SERN. Twelve criminal history risk variables were gathered. Endorsement of these static risk indicators was based primarily on reviews of the official criminal record and exposure/response to the criminal justice system for each offender. A review of official file(s) provided the specific information required pertaining to past and current convictions, community supervision, incarceration, breaches of trust (e.g. escape) and segregation for disciplinary reasons. Moreover, any other pertinent details regarding specific risk factors were included in the comment section. These data were available for all probationers assessed in the field test.

Percentage distributions of criminal history indicators are organized first by gender and then by setting. Then distributions, with tests for statistical significance, are provided for gender (men, women) and then for phase of supervision (0 to 6, 6 to 12, 12 months+). Probation outcomes (failures) are presented by criminal history indicators and risk level ratings by gender.

Static Factors Risk Indicators: Criminal Record

1. Criminal History Risk Indicators

The percentage distributions of selected criminal history indicators are presented by gender (see Table 3). Only three indicators showed any significant difference between men and women- previous probation period, previous adult conviction(s) and violent criminal offence(s)- in the field test study. Nevertheless, Table 3 clearly illustrates that regardless of gender there tends to have been previous involvement with the criminal justice system among the probationers. While a note of caution is warranted in over-interpreting the results, one-fifth of men and one-tenth of women probationers have previous convictions as adults. Moreover, nearly one-eighth of men and roughly one-twentieth of women probationers had previously been under community supervision. While there was a very low base rate of failure 2.1% (or 14/673) for men and 1.3% (or 1/78) for women, the most prominent criminal history risk indicators for failures among men probationers were being co-convicted (93%), no crime-free period of one year or more (86%), having been under age when their criminal history began (71%) and earlier probation term (57%). Not surprising, given the relative absence of failure among women probationers, only one of the criminal history risk indicators was indicated – co-convicted.

Table 3

Distribution of Criminal History Indicators by Gender

Criminal History Risk Indicators (12)	Men (n=673)	Failure (n=14)	Women (n=78)	Failure (n=1)
Under age	14%	71%	6%	0%
Previous adult conviction (s)	20%	43%	10%*	0%
Violent criminal offence(s)	17%	36%	5%*	0%
Earlier probationer	16%	57%	6%*	0%
Pre-release failure-technical	1%	0%	0%	0%
Pre-release failure-new crime	4%	29%	3%	0%
Earlier prison term	8%	36%	6%	0%
Escape/attempt/unlawfully at large	1%	14%	1%	0%
Confinement for disciplinary reasons	1%	7%	1%	0%
Less than six months since last incarceration	2%	21%	2%	0%
No crime-free period of one year or more	6%	86%	5%	0%
Co-convicted	45%	93%	49%	100%

* sig difference between men and women $p < .05$

2. Static Factors Rating (Risk) - Setting

Table 4 shows how the cases were distributed by risk level for the five settings. Overall, 67% of cases in the field test were classified as [low-risk], 28% were classified as [moderate-risk] and 5% were classified [high-risk].

Table 4

Distribution of Risk Level Ratings across Settings

Setting	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
Arges	185	78%	21%	2%
Cluj	165	57%	36%	7%
Constanta	227	66%	30%	4%
Suceava	93	67%	27%	7%
Vrancea	78	63%	26%	12%
Total	748[a]	67%	28%	5%

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

3. Static Factor Rating (Risk) - Gender

Table 5 displays how the cases in the field test were distributed by risk level for each gender. Overall, women were slightly more likely to have lower risk ratings in this field test.

Table 5

Distribution of Risk Level Ratings by Gender

Gender	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
Men	670 [failure=12]	65% [25%]	29% [17%]	6% [58%]
Women	78 [failure=1]	79% [0%]	18% [100%]	3% [0%]
Total	748[a] [failure=13]	67% [23%]	28% [23%]	5% [54%]

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 6.504 p=.039 (overall risk level by gender)

4. Static Factor Rating (Risk) – Supervision Phase

Table 6 presents how the cases in the field test were distributed by risk level for each supervision phase. There were no statistically significant differences in relative risk level ratings across the supervision phases in this field test.

Table 6

Distribution of Risk Level Ratings by Supervision Phase

Phase	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
0 to 6	322	67%	27%	6%
6 to 12	212	67%	27%	6%
12+	214	66%	30%	4%
Total	748[a]	67%	28%	5%

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 1.515 p=.824 (overall risk level by gender)

Part B. Dynamic Factors Assessment

1. Identified Needs

Tables 7 and 8 present how the cases in the field test were distributed by identified needs by gender and outcome. There were 18 needs indicators which fit in 9 domains. If any one of the two indicators was present in a specific domain, the probationer was considered to have a need in that domain. Overall, the most prominent needs domains identified were education, thinking/behavior, social contacts and employment (Table 7).

Table 7

Distribution of Identified Need Domains by Gender

Need Factors	Men (*n*=673)	Failure (*n*=14)	Women (*n*=78)	Failure (*n*=1)
Education	64%	93%	45%*	100%
Employment	39%	71%	40%	100%
Family Background	22%	64%	32%	100%
Social Contacts	39%	79%	33%	100%
Substance Abuse	21%	50%	8%*	0%
Community Living	20%	57%	30%	100%
Thinking/Behavior	44%	79%	31%*	0%
Criminal Attitude	32%	71%	41%	100%
Values Orientation	17%	64%	8%*	0%

* sig difference between men and women p <.05

Over 93% of failures for men had an identified education need and 79% of failure had an identified need in the social contacts and thinking/behavior domains. The substance abuse domain and failure on probation were not as closely linked with only 50% of failures having an identified need in the substance abuse domain.

Table 8

Distribution of Identified Need Indicators by Gender

Need Indicators (18)	Men (n=673)	Failure (n=14)	Women (n=78)	Failure (n=1)
Education				
Less than grade 10	35%	79%	32%	100%
Less than grade 12	58%	71%	41%*	100%
Employment				
Unemployed	36%	71%	36%	100%
Lacks work skills	12%	57%	18%	100%
Family Background				
Family attachment limited	14%	36%	13%	100%
Family members criminally active	13%	50%	23%*	100%
Social Contacts				
Affiliated with crime groups	15%	50%	10%	0%
Has criminal friends	37%	79%	33%	100%
Substance Abuse				
Abuses alcohol	14%	29%	5%*	0%
Uses drugs	8%	36%	4%	0%
Community Living				
No fixed accommodation or changes residences frequently	8%	21%	15%*	100%
Difficulties with financial management	17%	57%	19%	100%
Thinking/Behavior				
Has difficulty with self-control	21%	64%	8%*	0%
Linking actions to consequences is limited	39%	79%	30%	0%
Criminal Attitude				
Negative attitude towards legal system	11%	43%	13%	0%
Denies crime or uses excuses to minimize	29%	64%	39%	100%
Values Orientation				
Disrespect for persons or property	15%	50%	8%	0%
Supports use of violence	8%	50%	1%*	0%

* sig difference between men and women $p < .05$

Looking at the individual need indicators within the domains for men with probation failures having less than grade ten or grade twelve, criminal friends, linking actions to consequences and being unemployed were prevalent (>70% - Table 8). The relative absence of failure among women probationers prohibits any meaningful interpretation.

The relationships between each of the dynamic need domains was also examined using bivariate correlations. As Table 9 demonstrates the vast majority of these correlations were significant. Notably, the highest correlations (above 0.30) were observed between the family background and community living domains, the values orientation and social contacts domains, and the employment and community living domains.

Table 9

Inter-correlation (bivariate) Matrix of Needs

	Educ.	Empl.	Fam.	Social Cont.	Subst.	Comm.	Think.	Crim. Att.	Values
Educ.	-	.30 ***	.26 ***	.12 **	.01 ns	.14 ***	.12 **	.01 ns	.18 ***
Empl.		-	.29 ***	.21 ***	.07 ns	.31 ***	.17 ***	.14 ***	.20 ***
Fam.			-	.29 ***	.04 ns	.36 ***	.18 ***	.16 ***	.25 ***
Social cont.				-	.12 **	.19 ***	.19 ***	.15 ***	.35 ***
Subst.					-	.12 **	.08 ns	.02 ns	.11 **
Comm						-	.28 ***	.15 ***	.23 ***
Think.							-	.15 ***	.29 ***
Crim. Att.								-	.28 ***
Values									-
% with factor present	62%	39%	24%	39%	19%	21%	43%	33%	16%

Notes: * $p < .01$; ** $p < .001$; *** $p < .0001$; ns = non-signifiant. $N = 751$

It is important to highlight the lack of the relationship between the substance abuse domain and the majority of the other domains. This suggests that the assessment of substance

abuse requires deeper exploration.

There was also consistency between the dynamic need domains and the overall dynamic need identified by the probation officer. As Table 10 demonstrates, those with no need in a domain where likely to be assessed by the probation officer as having a low dynamic need overall. Conversely those assessed as having a need in a particular domain were more likely to be ranked by the probation officer as having moderate or high need.

For example, 58% of those with no need in the community living domain were rated by the probation officer as having low dynamic need and 5% as having high dynamic need. For those with an identified community living need, the probation officer ranked 13% as having low need and 33% as having high need.

The relationship between the dynamic need domains and the overall dynamic need was a moderate to strong relationship for most domains (Cramer's V ranged from 0.34 to 0.54). The substance abuse domain showed a somewhat weaker relationship with the overall dynamic need level (Cramer's V 0.23). This suggests that the substance abuse domain indicators may require future refinement.

Table 10

Overall Dynamic Need Level by Dynamic Need Domains

Domains	*Low Need*	*Moderate Need*	*High Need*	*Effect size* Cramer's V
Education				0.34***
No Need	70%	28%	2%	
Need	36%	49%	15%	
Employment				0.42***
No Need	65%	31%	4%	
Need	23%	56%	21%	
Family Background				0.45***
No Need	58%	38%	4%	
Need	19%	48%	33%	
Social Contacts				0.45***
No Need	64%	34%	2%	
Need	24%	52%	24%	
Substance Abuse				0.23***
No Need	54%	38%	8%	
Need	27%	53%	20%	
Community Living				0.44***
No Need	58%	37%	5%	
Need	13%	54%	33%	
Thinking/Behavior				0.38***
No Need	64%	33%	3%	
Need	29%	51%	20%	
Criminal Attitude				0.34***
No Need	58%	37%	5%	
Need	29%	49%	22%	
Values Orientation				0.54***
No Need	57%	39%	4%	
Need	5%	51%	44%	

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the dynamic need level rating and were excluded from the analysis

*** $p < .001$ Chi-Square Test

2. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Setting

Table 11 displays how the probationers were distributed by need level for each setting. In this field test study, Arges probationers were more likely to be assessed to be low need (69% over 49% average) whereas Cluj probationers were more likely to be assessed as high risk (19% over 10% average).

Table 11

Distribution of Need Level Ratings across Settings

Setting	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
Arges	185	69%	28%	3%
Cluj	165	44%	37%	19%
Constanta	228	47%	43%	10%
Suceava	93	30%	60%	10%
Vrancea	78	33%	53%	14%
Total	749[a]	49%	41%	10%

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the need level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 70.374 p <.0001

3. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Gender

Table 12 displays how the cases in the field test were distributed by need level by gender and outcome. In this field test, although not rising to the level of statistical significance, women probationers were slightly more likely than men probationers to be assessed to be lower need whereas men probationers were more likely than women probationers to be assessed to be higher need. Of special note, none of those assessed to be low needs failed while under supervision whereas the majority who failed was deemed to be high needs.

Table 12

Distribution of Need Level Ratings by Gender

Gender	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
Men	671 [failure=12]	48% [0%]	41% [33%]	11% [67%]
Women	78 [failure=1]	52% [0%]	40% [0%]	8% [100%]
Total	749[a] [failure=13]	49% [0%]	41% [31.0%]	10% [69.0%]

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the need level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 .981 p=.612 (overall need level by gender)

4. Dynamic Factors Rating (Need) – Supervision Phase

In Table 13, the distribution is presented of need level ratings by supervision phase. It appears that probationers who were on supervision 12 months or longer were more likely to be assessed as low need (59% over 49%, average) rather than moderate need (32% over 41% average).

Table 13

Distribution of Need Level Ratings by Supervision Phase

Phase	*n*	Low	Moderate	High
0 to 6	322	45%	45%	10%
6 to 12	214	43%	45%	12%
12+	213	59%	32%	9%
Total	749[a]	49%	41%	10%

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the need level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 14.233 p =.007

Part C. Risk/Need Level Assessment

1. Risk/Needs Rating and Setting

In Table 14, the distribution of risk/need levels for the various settings is presented. Overall, 44% of the cases were assessed as lower-risk, lower-need on a risk/need continuum whereas 4% were assessed to be at the higher-risk, higher-need end. Of particular note, among

Arges cases, nearly two-thirds were deemed to be [low-risk, low-needs] whereas 1% were assessed as [high-risk, high-need].

Table 14

Distribution of Risk/Need Levels by Setting

Setting	*n*	Low-Low	Low-Mod	Low-High	Mod-Low	Mod-Mod	Mod-High	High-Low	High-Mod	High-High
Arges	185	65%	13%	0.0%	4%	15%	2%	<1%	0%	1%
Cluj	165	38%	16%	3%	6%	20%	10%	0%	1%	6%
Constanta	227	40%	23%	3%	7%	19%	4%	0%	1%	3%
Suceava	93	26%	38%	3%	3%	21%	3%	1%	2%	3%
Vrancea	78	33%	28%	1%	0%	21%	5%	0%	4%	8%
Total	748[a]	44%	21%	2%	5%	18%	5%	<1%	1%	4%

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 100.663 $p < .0001$ (21 cells had expected counts below 5)

2. Risk/Needs Rating and Gender

Table 15 shows how the risk/need levels are distributed for gender and outcome. Relative to men probationers in the field test study, women probationers were slightly more likely to be assessed as [low-risk, low-need]. On the other hand, men probationers were found to be more likely than women probationers to be assessed as [high-risk, high-need] (4% and 1%, respectively). It is noteworthy that none of those assessed to be [low-risk, low-need] failed while under supervision.

Table 15

Distribution of Risk/Need Levels by Gender

Gender	*n*	Low-Low	Low-Mod	Low-High	Mod-Low	Mod-Mod	Mod-High	High-Low	High-Mod	High-High
Men	670 [failure n=12]	43% [0%]	21% [18%]	2% [8%]	5% [0%]	19% [8%]	5% [8%]	<1% [0%]	1% [8%]	4% [50%]
Women	78 [failure n=1]	52% [0%]	27% [0%]	1% [0%]	1% [0%]	11% [0%]	5% [100%]	0% [0%]	1% [0%]	1% [0%]
Total	748 [failure n=13]	44% [0%]	21% [15%]	2% [8%]	5% [0%]	18% [8%]	5% [15%]	<1% [0%]	1% [8%]	4% [46%]

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

χ^2 80.165 $p<.001$ (9 cells have expected counts less than 5) (overall need level by gender)

Part D. Indices: Static Risk, Dynamic Risk, Totals and Outcome

In moving towards a scoring mechanism for the SERN Scale, we then added together the ascribed values for each indicator (0 or 1) into a Static Risk (0 to 12), Dynamic Risk (0 to 18), and Total index score which summed the static and dynamic score for each case. Scored in this manner, the total scores on the SERN could range from 0 to 30 for all probationers. The correlation between the dynamic and static constructed indices was high at .52 supporting the construction of an overall SERN scale which combined the two scores.

1. Static Risk Index- Calculated

Not surprisingly, the majority of men and women probationers scored low on the calculated static risk index (less than 2). It is especially notable that higher static risk index scores were somewhat associated with a higher likelihood of probation failures (Table 16).

There was also a high correspondence between the calculated static risk index and the static risk level assessed by the probation officer (Table 17). Mean scores on the calculated risk index increased as the static risk level assigned by the probation officer increased regardless of the gender of the probationer. The relationship was a robust one with an effect size of 0.51.

For example, looking at the overall sample, we see that the mean score on the static risk index for those rated as low static risk was 0.61 and that the mean score for those rated as high was 4.98. The standard deviations for the means were relatively high reflecting the tendency for probationers to be grouped in the lower end of the static risk index (below 3).

Table 16

Distribution of Static Risk Index Scores by Gender and Outcome

Static Risk Index (0-12)	Men (*n*=673)	Failures (*n*=14)	Women (*n*=78)	Failures (*n*=1)
0	38%	0	45%	0
1	29%	1	37%	1
2	14%	0	8%	0
3	8%	6	6%	0
4	5%	0	3%	0
5	2%	1	-	-
6	2%	2	-	-
7	1%	1	-	-
8	<1%	1	-	-
9	<1%	2	-	-
10	-	-	-	-
11	-	-	1%	0
12	-	-	-	-

Table 17

Static Risk Level (assigned) compared to Static Risk Index (calculated)

Sample[a]	*Low Risk Level*	*Mod. Risk Level*	*High Risk Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
Overall	0.61 (0.81)	2.23 (1.40)	4.98 (2.27)	0.51***
Men	0.62 (0.83)	2.24 (1.41)	4.89 (2.05)	0.51***
Women	0.52 (0.65)	2.14 (1.23)	6.50 (6.36)	0.52***

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** p <.001 F-test (ANOVA)

There was also a strong relationship between the calculated static risk index and the probation officer assigned risk level regardless of the supervision phase of the probationer (Table

18). Effect sizes for the relationship between the calculated scale and the assigned level had a narrow range across supervision phases (0.54 to 0.61) This indicates that the calculated static risk index can reliably be used throughout the supervision period.

Table 18

Static Risk Level compared to Static Risk Index across Supervision Phases

Supervision Phase[a]	*Low Risk Level*	*Mod. Risk Level*	*High Risk Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
0 to 6 months	1.77 (1.43)	4.51 (2.18)	8.79 (3.00)	0.54***
6 to 12 months	1.80 (1.45)	4.66 (1.80)	10.46 (3.39)	0.67***
12+ months	1.90 (1.43)	5.27 (2.43)	10.00 (3.32)	0.61***

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** p <.001 F-test (ANOVA)

2. Dynamic Risk Index - Calculated

Utilizing the distribution of scores derived from the Dynamic Risk indicator ratings, the distribution of index scores are shown below in Table 19 by gender and outcome. Interestingly, the majority of men and women probationers scored relatively low on the dynamic risk index (less than 3). Again, as Dynamic Risk index scores increased so did the number of probation failures.

Table 19

Distribution of Dynamic Risk Index Scores by Gender and Outcome

Dynamic Risk Index	Men (n=673)	Failures (n=14)	Women (n=78)	Failures (n=1)
0	9%	0	10%	0
1	15%	0	19%	0
2	16%	2	18%	0
3	16%	0	14%	0
4	12%	0	4%	0
5	10%	1	12%	0
6	7%	0	8%	0
7	3%	0	4%	0
8	3%	1	4%	0
9	3%	1	5%	0
10	2%	4	1%	1
11	1%	0	1%	0
12	1%	0	-	-
13	1%	1	-	-
14	1%	2	-	-
15	<1%	1	-	-
16	<1%	1	-	-
17	<1%	0	-	-
18	-	-	-	-

As with the static risk index, there was a high correspondence between the calculated dynamic risk index and the dynamic need level assessed by the probation officer (Table 20). The relationship between the two scales was strong regardless of gender (eta squared of 0.51 to 0.60). The relatively high standard deviation values reflect the tendency of probationers to be clustered at the lower level of the dynamic risk index. As an example, looking at women probationers, we see that the mean dynamic risk index for those assigned a low need rating was 1.71 well those assigned with a high need rating had a mean of 7.83.

Table 20

Dynamic Need Level (assigned) compared to Dynamic Risk Index (calculated)

Sample[a]	*Low Need Level*	*Mod. Need Level*	*High Need Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
Overall	1.83 (1.43)	4.72 (2.15)	9.65 (3.26)	0.60***
Men	1.84 (1.44)	4.69 (2.12)	9.79 (3.24)	0.61***
Women	1.71 (1.35)	4.97 (2.36)	7.83 (3.19)	0.51***

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** p <.001 F-test (ANOVA)

There was also a strong relationship between the calculated Dynamic Risk index and the probation officer assigned need level regardless of the supervision phase of the probationer (Table 21). Effect sizes varied somewhat across supervision phases but were high indicating a robust relationship (Eta squared ranged from 0.45 to 0.64). This indicates that the calculated Dynamic Risk index can reliably be used throughout the supervision period.

Table 21

Dynamic Need Level compared to Dynamic Risk Index across Supervision Phases

Supervision Phase[a]	*Low Need Level*	*Mod. Need Level*	*High Need Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
0 to 6 months	0.60 (0.84)	2.06 (1.44)	4.61 (2.52)	0.45***
6 to 12 months	0.55 (0.83)	2.03 (1.25)	4.44 (1.87)	0.47***
12+ months	0.69 (0.73)	2.70 (1.40)	5.85 (2.03)	0.64***

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** p <.001 F-test (ANOVA)

3. Overall SERN index – calculated

In moving towards a combined Static Risk and Dynamic Risk scoring mechanism for the SERN, the two index scores that were identified for each offender were added and constructed a total SERN score for each case. Summed in this fashion, Table 22 presents the distribution of SERN total scores by gender and outcome. The overall mean of this scale was 5.14 with a standard deviation of 4.20.

Table 22

Distribution of Total SERN Index Scores by Gender and Outcome

Total SERN Index	Men (n=673)	Failures (n=14)	Women (n=78)	Failures (n=1)
0	6%	0	8%	0
1	11%	0	13%	0
2	12%	0	15%	0
3	13%	0	15%	0
4	12%	0	10%	0
5	10%	1	12%	0
6	7%	0	4%	0
7	8%	0	4%	0
8	5%	0	5%	0
9	4%	1	3%	0
10	3%	1	4%	0
11	2%	1	4%	1
12	1%	0	1%	0
13	1%	3	1%	0
14	1%	0	-	-
15	1%	1	-	-
16	1%	2	-	-
17	1%	1	-	-
18	<1%	0	-	-
19	<1%	0	-	-
20	<1%	1	-	-
21	<1%	0	-	-
22	<1%	0	1%	0
23	-	-	-	-
24	<1%	1	-	-
25	<1%	1	-	-
26	<1%	0	-	-

As Table 22 reflects, there is a wide distribution of scores ranging from 0 to 26 for men probationers and 0 to 22 for women probationers. Once more, as SERN total scores increased so did the number of probation failures. No probation failures occurred with SERN scores of 4 or less. Half of probation failures for men were associated with SERN scores of 13 or above.

Table 23

Static Risk Level compared to Total SERN Risk Index

Sample[a]	*Low Risk Level*	*Mod. Risk Level*	*High Risk Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
Overall	3.49 (2.74)	7.26 (3.61)	14.50 (4.89)	0.44***
Men	3.53 (2.79)	7.19 (3.61)	14.50 (4.71)	0.44***
Women	3.24 (2.35)	8.29 (3.60)	14.50 (10.61)	0.45***

[a] 3 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** $p < .001$ F-test (ANOVA)

Given the results from the preceding sections, it is not surprising that the SERN index demonstrates congruence with the probation officer assessed static risk and dynamic need levels. Table 23 highlights the relationship between the SERN index and the assessed static risk level. Effect sizes were moderate (0.44) and did not vary by gender. Lower mean SERN scores were associated with lower risk ratings and higher mean SERN scores were associated with higher assessed risk levels.

Similar results are seen in table 24 which compares assigned dynamic need levels to the total SERN index score. Effect sizes were moderate to high regardless of gender (eta squared of 0.47 to 0.55). The correspondence between the probation assigned need level and the total SERN index score can be illustrated by examining the results for men. A low dynamic need assessment had an associated mean score on the SERN index of 2.66 while those with a high need assessment had a SERN score of 12.92. The difference of over 10 points between the two ratings provides strong evidence for the correspondence between the calculated and assigned ratings.

Table 24

Dynamic Need Level compared to Total SERN Risk Index

Sample	*Low Need Level*	*Mod. Need Level*	*High Need Level*	*Effect size* Eta^2
	Mean of Risk Index (SD)			
Overall	2.61 (2.00)	6.15 (2.90)	12.77 (5.00)	0.55***
Men	2.66 (2.04)	6.16 (2.88)	12.92 (4.90)	0.56***
Women	2.29 (1.60)	6.00 (3.09)	11.00 (6.42)	0.47***

[a] 2 cases had missing values on the risk level rating scale and were excluded from the analysis

*** p <.001 F-test (ANOVA)

Part E. Inter-relationships between Need Domains and SERN Index

One method to explore the validity of the offender assessment evaluations is to examine the relationships between the various components of SERN – needs and SERN totals. Table 25 presents the relationships between the nine need domains and SERN totals overall and by gender. The relationship between the needs domains and the total SERN score overall is evident and strong. The difference in means is over 3 points for all the need domains except substance abuse.

An especially strong relationship is seen between the overall SERN score and the domains of family background, community living, and values orientation where the mean differences between those with a need and without is above 5. This pattern is similar for men. However, for women, there is no significant relationship between the total SERN score and the substance abuse and values orientation domains. This is likely due to the low indication of these needs for women (8%) and the sample size for women. The results that involve the substance abuse domain add additional evidence that the assessment of this domain may need to be re-examined.

Table 25

Means Comparison of SERN Totals by Needs

	Mean of SERN Total Score *(N = 751)*	Mean of SERN Total Score Men *(N = 673)*	Mean of SERN Total Score Women *(N = 78)*
Education			
No Need	2.77	2.78	2.77
Need	6.56***	6.57***	6.49***
Employment			
No Need	3.45	3.53	2.78
Need	7.81***	7.92***	6.94***
Family Background			
No Need	3.84	3.96	2.70
Need	9.32**	9.52***	8.12***
Social Contacts			
No Need	3.26	3.30	2.90
Need	8.12***	8.19***	7.50***
Substance Abuse			
No Need	4.68	4.72	4.38
Need	7.07***	7.15***	5.17(ns)
Community Living			
No Need	4.03	4.09	3.42
Need	9.32***	9.74***	6.87**
Thinking/Behavior			
No Need	3.54	3.56	3.42
Need	7.24***	7.29***	6.71***
Criminal Attitude			
No Need	3.95	4.00	3.46
Need	7.53***	7.78***	5.84**
Values Orientation			
No Need	4.02	4.03	3.97
Need	10.83***	10.87***	10.00(ns)
Mean (SD)	5.14 (4.20)	5.21 (4.23)	4.43 (380)

Notes: * $p < .01$; ** $p < .001$; *** $p < .0001$; ns = non-signifiant using Independent Sample t-tests

Discussion

The application of a systematic approach to assessing the risk and needs of RPS probationers which might affect their successful reintegration to the community is a major component of an integrated case management approach. Recently, ensuring correctional interventions effectively address identified offender needs have evolved internationally into a widely accepted correctional practice. This field test familiarized probation staff in RPS with a systematic risk/needs assessment process and explored the viability of an enhanced case management approach in corrections.

To capture relevant offender risk and need information, the 'Static Factors' and 'Dynamic Factors' risk assessment components of CSC's assessment processes was adapted and field tested for use in Romanian corrections. The individual ratings for both "risk" (low-, moderate- and high) and "need" (low-, moderate- and high) were retained as well as the individual endorsements for each of the twelve criminal history background items and nine need areas and their respective indicators. In addition, the selected criminal history background indicators (12) coupled with need indicators (18) provides a streamlined approach to gathering case-specific information on well-established correlates and predictors of criminal re-offending.

A field test of the SERN in Romania revealed the following:

1) Confirmed that probation staff could differentiate probationers according to criminal history background indicators, risk level ratings, nine need domains with indicators and need level ratings;
2) Replicated other correctional research which found a significant relationship between level of risk and level of need, number of identified risks and level, as well as criminal history background indicators and level of risk; and
3) Demonstrated gender-related differences in relation to type of needs. Women probationers were found to have more identified needs in the areas of employment and marital/family relations. Men probationers were more likely than women probationers to have identified needs in the area of community functioning. The three most prominent identified need areas for women probationers include associates/social interaction, personal/emotional orientation

and employment. For men probationers, the three most prominent identified need areas include substance abuse, associates/social interaction and employment.

Conclusions

In sum, the field test of SERN revealed that variation or individual differences in criminal history background and need areas of probationer's plays an important role in the successful management and reintegration of probationers in the community. Nevertheless, it would seem that a systematic approach to offender assessment could be used to effectively communicate the intensity of correctional interventions required by capitalizing on the professional judgments of probation staff in RPS. As well, the various need domains can also provide a useful means to monitor changes in the offender's behaviour, attitudes and circumstances which should prove to be related to community supervision outcome.

By using SERN, the RPS has more structured information about probationers under its supervision than it did before. This assessment tool collects case-specific and strategic information on probationers RPS is dealing with – where they are, what they are like and what kind of problems they will likely experience while under supervision in the community. Although identifying key areas for service delivery has merit, the next challenge will be to conduct a representative field survey exercise to yield estimates of resource requirements for various intervention strategies in responding to offender risk and needs.

References

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J. and Hoge, R.D. (1990). *Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology*, Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 17 (1990): 19-52.

Brown, S., and Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis Component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review*. Research Report R-164. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.

Motiuk, L.L. (1997a). *Assessment methods in corrections*. ICCA Journal on Community Corrections, 7, 24.

Motiuk, L.L. (1997b). *Classification for correctional programming: The Offender Intake Assessment process*. Forum on Corrections Research, 9(1), 18-22.

Motiuk, L.L. and Bonta, J. (1991). *Prediction and Matching in Corrections: An examination of the risk principle in case classification.* Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Annual Convention, Calgary, Alberta.

Motiuk, L.L. and Porporino, F.J. (1989a). *Offender risk/needs assessment: A study of conditional releases*. Research Report 01. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.

Motiuk, L.L. and Porporino, F.J. (1989b). *Field test of the Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: A study of probationers on caseload*. Research Report 06. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A

Probationer Risk/Needs Assessment – I

Personal Identification:		
PIN #:	**Last name:**	**First name:**
GENDER: male ○ female ○	**DOB:**	**AGE:**

Purpose:

Pre-sentence ○
Sentence Postponement ○
Supervision ○
Parole ○
Minor ○

Supervision Phase:

0 to 6 months ○
6 to 12 months ○
12 + months ○

Assessor:

Assessment date (dd/mm/yyyy):

Section 1: Static Risk Factors *(Check off accordingly)*

		Yes	No	Unknown
Under age?		○	○	○
Previous adult conviction (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Violent criminal offence (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Earlier probation term (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Pre-release failure-technical (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Pre-release failure-new crime (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Earlier prison term (s)?	#___	○	○	○
Escape/attempt/unlawfully at large?	#___	○	○	○
Confinement for disciplinary reasons?	#___	○	○	○
Less than six months since last incarceration?		○	○	○
No crime-free period of one year or more?		○	○	○
Co-convicted?		○	○	○
	Total			
Risk Level (general)				

Category	Low	Moderate	High
	o	o	o

Observations/Comments:

Section 2: Criminogenic Needs *(Check off accordingly)*

	Yes	No	Unknown	Asset?
Education:				
Less than 10?	o	o	o	
Less than 12 or equivalent?	o	o	o	
Employment:				
Unemployed?	o	o	o	
Lacks work skills?	o	o	o	
Family Background:				
Family attachment limited?	o	o	o	
Family members criminally active?	o	o	o	
Social Contacts:				
Affiliated with crime groups?	o	o	o	
Criminal friends?	o	o	o	
Substance Abuse:				
Abuses alcohol?	o	o	o	
Uses drugs?	o	o	o	
Community Functioning:				
No fixed accommodation or changes residence frequently?	o	o	o	
Difficulties with financial management?	o	o	o	
Thinking/Behavior:				
Linking actions to consequences is limited?	o	o	o	
Has difficulty with self-control?	o	o	o	
Criminal Attitude:				
Negative attitude towards legal system?	o	o	o	
Denies crime or uses excuses to minimize?	o	o	o	
Value Orientation:				
Disrespect for persons or property?	o	o	o	
Supports use of violence?	o	o	o	
Total				
Needs Level (general)				
Category	**Low**	**Moderate**	**High**	
	o	o	o	

Section 3: Special Needs and Summary

Special Needs:

Physical:	Mental Health:	Security:	Suicidal:	Self-injurious:	Other:
○	○	○	○	○	○

Priority Needs:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Overall Risk-Needs:

	Low	Medium	High
Low		○	○
Medium	○	○	○
High	○	○	○

Motivation:

Low	Medium	High
○	○	○

Observations/Comments: